26

27

28



BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

in the many digital	
COMMISSIONERS 2010 JAN 25 A 11: 1	i, q
KRISTEN K. MAYES, Chairman	Arizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED
PAUL NEWMAN SANDRA D. KENNEDY	JAN 2 6 2010
BOB STUMP	DOCKETED BY W
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. FOR A RATE INCREASE	DOCKET NO. G-02527A-09-0088
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF (CRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. GAS (COUNTY OF A LOAN (COUNTY OF A	DOCKET NO. G-02527A-09-0032
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF (CONTROLL) GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. WATER (CONTROLL) DIVISION FOR A RATE INCREASE (CONTROLL)	DOCKET NO. W-02527A-09-0201
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF (CRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. WATER (COUNTY OF A LOAN (COUNTY OF	DOCKET NO. W-02527A-09-0033
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF (COOPERATIVE, INC. FOR APPROVAL OF A LOAN GUARANTEE (COOPERATIVE)	DOCKET NO. E-01749A-09-0087
Graham County Utilities, Inc. ("GCU") hereby	files the Rejoinder Testimony of John V.
Wallace in the above-referenced matter.	- ·
RESPECTEULLY SURMITTED	this 26 th day of January 2010

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 26th day of January, 2010.

Ву

John V. Wallace

Grand Canyon State Electric Cooperative Assn., Inc. Consultant for Graham County Utilities, Inc.



Original and nineteen (19) copies filed this 26th day of January, 2010, with:

Docket Control Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 W. Washington Phoenix, AZ 85007

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS

KRISTEN K. MAYES, CHAIRMAN GARY PIERCE BOB STUMP PAUL NEWMAN SARAH KENNEDY

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. FOR A RATE INCREASE) DOCKET NO. G-02527A-09-0088)
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. GAS DIVISION FOR APPROVAL OF A LOAN	DOCKET NO. G-02527A-09-0032
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. WATER DIVISION FOR A RATE INCREASE	DOCKET NO. W-02527A-09-0201
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC. WATER DIVISION FOR APPROVAL OF A LOAN	DOCKET NO. W-02527A-09-0033
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF GRAHAM COUNTY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC. FOR APPROVAL OF A LOAN GUARANTEE	DOCKET NO. E-01749A-09-0087)))

REJOINDER

TESTIMONY

OF

JOHN V. WALLACE

GRAHAM COUNTY UTILITIES, INC.

JANUARY 26, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
Sum	amary	
I.	Introduction and Summary of Recommendations	1
II.	GCU's Comments on Staff's Surrebuttal Testimony	3

Rejoinder Testimony of John V. Wallace Docket No. G-02527A-09-088 et al. Page 1

1

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

2

Q. Please state your name address and occupation.

3

A. My name is John V. Wallace. I am the Director of Regulatory and Strategic Services of Grand Canyon State Electric Cooperative Association ("GCSECA"). I am filing rejoinder testimony on behalf of Graham County Utilities, Inc. ("GCU" or "Cooperative").

6

5

7

Q. Have you filed direct and rebuttal testimony in these dockets?

9

8

A. Yes. I have.

10

11

Q. On whose behalf are you appearing in this proceeding?

12

A. I am appearing on behalf of the applicants, GCU Gas and Water Divisions.

13

14

Q. Was this testimony prepared by you or under your direction?

15

A. Yes, it was.

1617

Q. What areas does your testimony address?

18

19

20

A. My testimony addresses the surrebuttal testimony of the Arizona Corporation Commission Staff ("Staff") witnesses. In an effort to expedite the Commission's processing of these cases, GCU has limited the number of issues it will address in this testimony. Silence on any Staff issues raised and recommendations provided does not

2122

indicate agreement.

2324

Q. Please summarize your recommendations.

25

26

A. In an effort to expedite the processing of these cases, GCU did not take a position on each issue raised by Staff witnesses in their direct and surrebuttal testimony. GCU is stipulating to all the recommendations contained in Staff Witnesses Allen's, Stukov's,

Miller's, Wallace's, Manrique's, Gray's and Bahl's direct testimony.

27

28

_

GCU stipulates to all of the recommendations found in Ms. McNeely-Kirwan's direct and surrebuttal testimony except the recommendation found in her surrebuttal testimony that states that GCU should file proposed DSM programs in this docket 60 days after the effective date of a decision in this matter. GCU is requesting that it be allowed to file its DSM/Energy Efficiency programs 120 days after the effective date of the decision in this matter. This will give GCU the time and the resources necessary to comply with this recommendation.

GCU stipulates to all of the recommendations found in Ms. Allen's direct and surrebuttal testimony. GCU reiterates the need for its recommended TIER and DSC ratios and corresponding revenue requirement as a result of stipulating to Ms. Allen's recommendation that states that GCU should refund the over-charged line extension costs over a three year period from the effective date of the decision in this matter.

GCU stipulates to all of the recommendations found in Mr. McMurray's testimony except the recommendation found on Schedule GTM-2 of his direct testimony that states that GCU should receive a Times Interest Earned Ratio ("TIER") and Debt Service Coverage Ratio ("DSC") of 2.38 and 1.94 respectively. For the reasons stated in my direct, rebuttal and rejoinder testimony, GCU's requested TIER of 3.01 and DSC of 2.27 should be granted resulting in a revenue requirement of \$4,282,784 versus the Staff recommended revenue requirement of \$4,222,160.

Finally, GCU stipulates to all of the recommendations found in Mr. Chaves' direct testimony except GCU has proposed an alternate inclining block tiered rate structure.

Rejoinder Testimony of John V. Wallace Docket No. G-02527A-09-088 et al. Page 3

II. GCU'S COMMENTS ON STAFF DIRECT TESTIMONY

- Q. Does GCU have any comments on Staff Witness McNeely-Kirwan's surrebuttal testimony?
- A. Yes. GCU stipulates to all of the recommendations found in Ms. McNeely-Kirwan's direct and surrebuttal testimony except that GCU would request that it be allowed to file proposed DSM programs in this docket 120 days after the effective date of the decision in this case. As discussed previously in my rebuttal testimony GCU has no in-house expertise on the development and implementation of DSM and Energy Efficiency ("EE") programs. Consequently, GCU will need to hire an outside consultant to determine the type, costs and benefits associated with gas EE programs. The 120 day time frame will give GCU the time and the resources necessary to comply with this recommendation.
- Q. Does GCU have any comments on Staff Witness Allen's direct testimony?
- A. Yes. GCU stipulates to all of the recommendations found in Ms. Allen's direct and rebuttal testimony. GCU requests that its higher TIER and DSC ratios and corresponding revenue requirement by granted so it can afford to refund the over-charged line extension costs over a three year period from the effective date of the decision in this matter.
- Q. Does GCU have any comments on Staff Witness McMurray's direct testimony?
- A. Yes. GCU stipulates to all of the recommendations found in Mr. McMurray's testimony except the recommendation found on Schedule GTM-2 of his direct testimony that states that GCU should receive a Times Interest Earned Ratio ("TIER") and Debt Service Coverage Ratio ("DSC") of 2.38 and 1.94 respectively. These ratios are considerably lower than what GCU requested to be able to fund operations and plant improvements. These lower ratios are compounded by the fact that GCU's financial condition continues

to deteriorate and the fact that GCU has stipulated to the Staff recommendations that it must refund approximately \$226,000 of over-charged line extension costs over a three year period from the effective date of the decision in this matter. Finally, in accordance with previous Commission Decision No. 69245, GCU must make progress towards meeting a 30 percent equity requirement. GCU's positive equity balance amount has declined from \$519,672 in 2007 to \$386,270 in 2008 to a negative equity amount of \$129,870. Staff does not dispute the fact that GCU's proposed revenue requirement for the Gas Division will result in a higher equity ratio than the Staff recommended revenue requirement for the Gas Division. For the reasons stated in my direct, rebuttal and rejoinder testimony, GCU's requested TIER of 3.01 and DSC of 2.27 should be granted resulting in a revenue requirement of \$4,282,784 versus the Staff recommended revenue requirement of \$4,222,160 found in Staff Witness McMurray's testimony.

- Q. Does GCU have any comments on Staff Witness Chaves' direct testimony?
- A. Yes. GCU stipulates to all of the recommendations found in Mr. Chaves' direct testimony except GCU has proposed an alternate inclining block tiered rate structure. GCU is concerned that Staff's tiered rate structure will result in rate shock for customers who use over 9,000 gallons because the rate per 1,000 gallons increases by 113 percent from \$2.55 to \$5.43. In addition, a large portion of GCU's revenues are collected from customers who use over 9,000 gallons. According to Staff's Typical Bill Analysis ("TBA"), Staff's tiered rate design results in average customers in the 1" and 1 ½" classes receiving rate increases in excess of 56% and in the 2" and 4" classes receiving increases in excess of 78%. (Please refer to the attached Staff TBAs).

Mr. Chaves states in his surrebuttal testimony that my assertion in my rebuttal testimony that there will be a significant amount of customer conservation and lost revenue for GCU "is unsupported speculation and not quantifiable". If Staff now believes there will not be significant amount of conservation that will result from its recommended tiered

Rejoinder Testimony of John V. Wallace Docket No. G-02527A-09-088 et al. Page 5

rate design, then GCU would request that its customers not be subjected to the extreme increases that result from Staff's recommended tiered rates.

Finally, GCU currently has water resources well in excess of its demand for the next 5 years as confirmed by Staff Witness Stukov in Exhibit KS. GCU's proposed tiered rate structure will provide customers with an incentive to conserve and will provide a more gradual transition between a flat rate and tiered rate structure. For these reasons, GCU recommends its proposed tiered rate structure be adopted.

- Q. Does GCU have any comments on Staff Witness Stukov's direct testimony including the recently filed exhibit on Staff's recommended hook-up fees?
- A. Yes. In an effort to limit the issues in these rate cases, GCU will not be taking a position on each issue raised in Staff Witness Stukov's direct testimony despite the fact that it could provide compelling arguments on some of the issues raised by Ms. Stukov. GCU stipulates to all of the recommendations found in Ms. Stukov's direct testimony including her recommendations on hook-up fees.
- Q. Does that conclude your rejoinder testimony?
- A. Yes, it does.

Graham County Utilities, Inc. - Water Division Docket No. W-02527A-09-0201

Test Year Ended September 31, 2008

Typical Bill Analysis 5/8" x 3/4"

Company Proposed	Gallons	Present Rates		Proposed Rates	Dollar Increase	Percent Increase
Average Usage	9,000	\$ 39.75	\$	47.70	\$ 7.95	20.00%
Median Usage	5,000	29.55		34.90	\$ 5.35	18.10%
Staff Recommended						
Average Usage	9,000	\$ 39.75	\$	49.25	\$ 9.50	23.90%
Median Usage	5,000	29.55		33.25	\$ 3.70	12.52%

Present & Proposed Rates (Without Taxes) 5/8" x 3/4"

		Company			Staff	
Gallons	Present	Proposed	%	Re	commended	%
Consumption	Rates	Rates	Increase		Rates	Increase
-	\$ 16.80	\$ 19.50	16.07%	\$	17.00	1.19%
1,000	19.35	22.50	16.28%		19.75	2.07%
2,000	21.90	25.50	16.44%		22.50	2.74%
3,000	24.45	28.50	16.56%		25.25	3.27%
4,000	27.00	31.70	17.41%		29.25	8.33%
5,000	29.55	34.90	18.10%		33.25	12.52%
6,000	32.10	38.10	18.69%		37.25	16.04%
7,000	34.65	41.30	19.19%		41.25	19.05%
8,000	37.20	44.50	19.62%		45.25	21.64%
9,000	39,75	47.70	20.00%		49.25	23.90%
10,000	42.30	51.21	21.06%		54.68	29.27%
11,000	44.85	54.72	22.01%		60.11	34.02%
12,000	47.40	58.23	22.85%		65.54	38.27%
13,000	49.95	61.74	23.60%		70.97	42.08%
14,000	52.50	65.25	24.29%		76.40	45.52%
15,000	55.05	68.76	24.90%		81.83	48.65%
16,000	57.60	72.27	25.47%	٠	87.26	51.49%
17,000	60.15	75.78	25.99%		92.69	54,10%
18,000	62.70	79.29	26.46%		98.12	56.49%
19,000	65.25	82.80	26.90%		103.55	58.70%
20,000	67.80	86.31	27.30%		108.98	60.74%
25,000	80.55	103.86	28.94%		136.13	69.00%
30,000	93.30	121.41	30.13%		163.28	75.01%
35,000	106.05	138.96	31.03%		190.43	79.57%
40,000	118.80	156.51	31.74%		217.58	83.15%
45,000	131.55	174.06	32.31%		244.73	86.04%
50,000	144.30	191.61	32.79%		271.88	88.41%
75,000	208.05	279,36	34.28%		407.63	95.93%
100,000	271.80	367.11	35.07%		543.38	99.92%

Graham County Utilities, Inc. - Water Division Docket No. W-02527A-09-0201 Test Year Ended September 31, 2008

Typical Bill Analysis

1"

Company Proposed	Gallons	 Present Rates	F	Proposed Rates	,	Dollar Increase	Percent Increase
Average Usage	18,000	\$ 68.90	\$	85.00	\$	16.10	23.37%
Median Usage	15,000	61.25		76.00	\$	14.75	24.08%
Staff Recommended		 					
Average Usage	18,000	\$ 68.90	\$	108.00	\$	39.10	56.75%
Median Usage	15,000	61.25		96.00	\$	34.75	56.73%

Present & Proposed Rates (Without Taxes)

4"

		(Company		Staff	
Gallons	Present		Proposed	%	Recommended	%
Consumption	Rates		Rates	Increase	Rates	Increase
-	\$ 23.00	\$	31.00	34.78%	\$ 38,00	56.52%
1,000	25.55		34.00	33.07%	40.00	56.56%
2,000	28.10		37.00	31.67%	44.00	56.58%
3,000	30.65		40.00	30.51%	48.00	56.61%
4,000	33.20		43.00	29.52%	52.00	56.63%
5,000	35.75		46.00	28.67%	58.00	56.64%
6,000	38.30		49.00	27.94%	60.00	56.66%
7,000	40.85		52.00	27.29%	64.00	56.67%
8,000	43.40		55.00	26.73%	68.00	56.68%
9,000	45.95		58.00	26.22%	72.00	56.69%
10,000	48.50		61.00	25.77%	76.00	56.70%
11,000	51.05		64.00	25.37%	80.08	56.71%
12,000	53.60		67.00	25.00%	84.00	56.72%
13,000	56.15		70.00	24.67%	88.00	56.72%
14,000	58.70		73.00	24.36%	92.00	56.73%
15,000	61.25		76.00	24.08%	96.00	56.73%
16,000	63.80		79.00	23.82%	100.00	56.74%
17,000	66.35		82.00	23.59%	104.00	56.74%
18,000	68.90		85.00	23.37%	108.00	56.75%
18,259	69.56		85.78	23.31%	109.04	56.75%
19,000	71.45		88.00	23.16%	112.00	56.75%
20,000	74.00		91.20	23.24%	117.43	58.69%
25,000	86.75		107.20	23.57%	144.58	66.66%
30,000	99.50		123.20	23,82%	171.73	72.59%
35,000	112.25		139.20	24.01%	198.88	77.18%
40,000	125.00		155.20	24.16%	226.03	80.82%
45,000	137.75	,	171.20	24.28%	253.18	83.80%
50,000	150.50		187.20	24.39%	280.33	86.27%
75,000	214.25		267.20	24.71%	416.08	94.20%
100,000	278.00		347.20	24.89%	551.83	98.50%

Graham County Utilities, Inc. - Water Division Docket No. W-02527A-09-0201

Test Year Ended September 31, 2008

Typical Bill Analysis 1 1/2"

Company Proposed	Gallons	 Present Rates	Proposed Rates	···········	Dollar Increase	Percent Increase
Average Usage	26,000	\$ 96.30	\$ 115.90	\$	19.60	20.35%
Median Usage	15,000	68.25	81.50	\$	13.25	19.41%
Staff Recommended						
Average Usage	26,000	\$ 96.30	\$ 152.01	\$	55.71	57.85%
Median Usage	15,000	68.25	98.00	\$	29.75	43.59%

Present & Proposed Rates (Without Taxes) 1 1/2"

		Company		Staff	
Gallons	Present	Proposed	%	Recommended	%
Consumption	Rates	Rates	Increase	Rates	Increase
•	\$ 30.0	0 \$ 36.50	21.67%	\$ 38.00	26.67%
1,000	32.5	5 39.50	21.35%	42.00	29.03%
2,000	35.1	0 42.50	21.08%	46.00	31,05%
3,000	37.6	5 45.50	20.85%	50.00	32.80%
4,000	40.2	0 48.50	20.65%	54.00	34.33%
5,000	42.7	5 51.50	20.47%	58.00	35.67%
6,000	45.3	0 54.50	20.31%	62.00	36.87%
7,000	47.8	5 57.50	20.17%	66.00	37,93%
8,000	50.4	0 60.50	20.04%	70.00	38.89%
9,000	52.9	5 63.50	19.92%	74.00	39.75%
10,000	55.5	0 66.50	19.82%	78.00	40.54%
11,000	58.0	5 69.50	19.72%	82.00	41.26%
12,000	60.6	0 72.50	19.64%	86.00	41.91%
13,000	63.1	5 75.50	19.56%	90.00	42.52%
14,000	65.7	0 78.50	19.48%	94.00	43.07%
15,000	68.2		19.41%	98.00	43.59%
16,000	70.8	0 84.50	19.35%	102.00	44.07%
17,000	73.3	5 87.50	19.29%	106.00	44.51%
18,000	75.9	0 90.50	19.24%	110.00	44.93%
26,000	96.3	0 115.90	20.35%	152.01	57.85%
19,000	78.4	5 93.50	19.18%	114.00	45.32%
20,000	81.0		19.38%	119.43	47.44%
25,000	93.7		20.21%	146.58	56.35%
30,000	106.5	0 128.70	20.85%	173.73	63.13%
35,000	119.2	5 144.70	21.34%	200.88	68.45%
40,000	132.0		21.74%	228.03	72.75%
45,000	144.7		22.07%	255.18	76.29%
50,000	157.5		22.35%	282.33	79.26%
75,000	221.2		23.25%	418.08	88.96%
100,000	285.0	0 352.70	23.75%	553.83	94.33%

Graham County Utilities, Inc. - Water Division Docket No. W-02527A-09-0201

Test Year Ended September 31, 2008

Typical Bill Analysis 2"

Company Proposed	Gallons	Present Rates	Proposed Rates	 Dollar Increase	Percent Increase
Average Usage	16,000	\$ 57.60	\$ 87.00	\$ 29.40	51.04%
Median Usage	13,000	49.95	78.00	\$ 28.05	56.16%
Staff Recommended			 		
Average Usage	16,000	\$ 62.70	\$ 114.00	\$ 51.30	81.82%
Median Usage	13,000	55.05	102.00	\$ 46.95	85.29%

Present & Proposed Rates (Without Taxes)

		Company		Staff	
Gallons	Present	Proposed	%	Recommended	%
Consumption	Rates	Rates	Increase	Rates	Increase
	\$ 16.80	\$ 39.00	132.14%	\$ 42.00	150.00%
1,000	19.35	42.00	117.05%	46.00	137.73%
2,000	21.90	45.00	105.48%	50.00	128.31%
3,000	24.45	48.00	96.32%	54.00	120.86%
4,000	27.00	51.00	88.89%	58.00	114.81%
5,000	29.55	54.00	82.74%	62.00	109.81%
6,000	32.10	57.00	77.57%	66.00	105.61%
7,000	34.65	60.00	73.16%	70.00	102.02%
8,000	37.20	63.00	69,35%	74.00	98.92%
9,000	39.75	66.00	66.04%	78.00	96.23%
10,000	42.30	69.00	63.12%	82.00	93.85%
11,000	44.85	72.00	60.54%	86.00	91.75%
12,000	47.40	75.00	58.23%	90.00	89.87%
13,000	49.95	78.00	56.16%	94.00	88.19%
14,000	52.50	81.00	54.29%	98.00	86.67%
15,000	55.05	84.00	52.59%	102.00	85.29%
16,000	57.60	87.00	51.04%	106.00	84.03%
17,000	60.15	90.00	49.63%	110.00	82.88%
18,000	62.70	93,00	48.33%	114.00	81.82%
26,000	83.10	118,20	42.24%	154.58	86.02%
19,000	65.25	96.00	47.13%	118.00	80.84%
20,000	67.80	99.00	46.02%	122.00	79.94%
25,000	80.55	115.00	42.77%	149.15	85.16%
30,000	93.30	131.00	40.41%	176.30	88.96%
35,000	106.05	147.00	38.61%	203.45	91.84%
40,000	118.80	163.00	37.21%	230.60	94.11%
45,000	131.55	179.00	36.07%	257.75	95.93%
50,000	144.30	195.00	35.14%	284.90	97.44%
75,000	208.05	275.00	32.18%	420.65	102.19%
100,000	271.80	355.00	30.61%	556.40	104.71%

Graham County Utilities, Inc. - Water Division Docket No. W-02527A-09-0201

Test Year Ended September 31, 2008

Typical Bill Analysis Resale (4")

Company Proposed	Gallons	 Present Rates	· F	roposed Rates	······································	Dollar Increase	Percent Increase
Average Usage	903,000	\$ 1,393.53	\$	1,791.76	\$	398.23	28.58%
Median Usage	903,000	1,393.53		1,791.76	\$	398.23	28.58%
Staff Recommended							
Average Usage	903,000	\$ 1,393.53	\$	2,488.10	\$	1,094.57	78.55%
Median Usage	903,000	1,393.53		2,488.10	\$	1,094.57	78.55%

Present & Proposed Rates (Without Taxes) Resale (4")

		Сотрапу			Staff	
Gallons	Present	Proposed	%	Re	ecommended	%
Consumption	Rates	Rates	Increase		Rates	Increase
_	\$ 30.00	\$ 58.00	93.33%	\$	50.00	66.67%
1,000	31.51	59.92	90.16%		52.70	67.25%
2,000	33.02	61.84	87.28%		55.40	67.78%
3,000	34.53	63.76	84.65%		58.10	68.26%
4,000	36.04	65.68	82.24%		60.80	68.70%
5,000	37.55	67.60	80.03%		63.50	69.11%
6,000	39.06	69.52	77.98%		66.20	69.48%
7,000	40.57	71.44	76.09%		68.90	69.83%
8,000	42.08	73.36	74.33%		71.60	70.15%
9,000	43.59	75.28	72.70%		74.30	70.45%
10,000	45.10	77.20	71.18%		77.00	70.73%
11,000	46.61	79,12	69.75%		79.70	70.99%
12,000	48.12	81.04	68.41%		82.40	71.24%
13,000	49.63	82.96	67.16%		85.10	71.47%
14,000	51.14	84.88	65.98%		87.80	71.69%
15,000	52.65	86.80	64.86%		90.50	71.89%
16,000	54.16	88.72	63.81%		93.20	72.08%
17,000	55.67	90.64	62.82%		95.90	72.27%
18,000	57.18	92.56	61.87%		98.60	72.44%
26,000	69.26	107.92	55.82%		120.20	73.55%
19,000	58,69	94.48	60.98%		101.30	72.60%
20,000	60.20	96.40	60.13%		104.00	72.76%
25,000	67.75	106.00	56.46%		117.50	73.43%
30,000	75.30	115.60	53.52%		131.00	73.97%
35,000	82.85	125.20	51.12%		144.50	74.41%
40,000	90.40	134.80	49.12%		158.00	74.78%
45,000	97. 9 5	144.40	47.42%		171.50	75.09%
50,000	105.50	154.00	45.97%		185.00	75.36%
75,000	143.25	202.00	41.01%		252.50	76.27%
100,000	181.00	250.00	38,12%		320.00	76.80%
903,000	1,393.53	1,791.76	28.58%		2,488.10	78.55%